MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Held in Washington, D. C.; March 19 and 20, 1951

The fifth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1951, was held in its Office in the Interior Department Building on Monday, March 19th and Tuesday, March 20th, 1951. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Chairman,
Mr. Reild, Vice Chairman,
Prof. Hudnut,
Prof. Belluschi,
Mr. Peets,
Mr. Biddle,
Mr. deWeldon,

also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The minutes of the Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on January 25, 1951, were approved.

2. GIFT OF SET OF DISHES FOR THE WHITE HOUSE: Chairman Finley reported that a few weeks ago he received an offer from Mrs. Ira Nelson Morris of a set of china in the same design as that in use by the White House. The china had been used by Mr. and Mrs. Morris in the American Legation in Sweden. The White House would be very glad to accept the china, since it is the same kind now used there, and to accept it would save a certain amount of money. The set comprises several hundred pieces.

On motion, properly moved and seconded, the Commission decided to recommend acceptance of the gift. A letter of thanks was sent to Mrs. Morris (Exhibit A).

3. GIFT OF CHAIRS FOR THE WHITE HOUSE: Chairman Finley reported that recently he received word from General and Mrs. A. Gorger Goodyear that they

wish to present two Eighteenth Century winged arm chairs, in walnut, to the White House, and that the Chief Usher, Mr. Crim, has advised that such gift would be acceptable. He would like to use them on the ground floor. The Commission thereupon approved acceptance of the gift (Exhibit E).

4. GIFTS FOR THE WHITE HOUSE: Mr. Reild asked if there is a Committee on Furnishings of the White House that passes on such gifts. Mr. Finley replied:

> "There is no Committee on Furnishing the White House, except the Commission on the Renovation of the Executive Mansion, which was appointed by Congress and has charge of the work. They authorize payment and also pass finally on the decoration of the White House; that is, fabrics, etc., for which they are expending money now,-buying new articles. But for the gift of articles from outside and for which the Government is not paying, there is no Committee. The President and Mrs. Truman, Mr. Crim and I usually pass on them. When I learn that they are acceptable to the President and Mrs. Truman, I have been bringing the matter to the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts for their recommendation in the matter. These objects are then brought before the Commission on the Renovation of the Executive Mansion. Mr. Wm. Adams Delano, Consulting Architect, and Mr. Winslow, the Architect of the White House help in doing this; and I have been asked by that Commission to act as an advisor on such matters."

Thereupon Mr. Hudnut stated, "You have two authorities. Supposing we accept something and the Commission on the Executive Mansion does not like it. What happens then?"

> Mr. Finley replied. "That is a very good point. Heretofore, we had a Subcommittee of the Fine Arts Commission which passed on those things, so as to avoid bothering all the members of the Commission about every object that was offered. It consisted of one or two members of the Commission and two or three outsiders, and that worked very well. If that Committee recommended acceptance of a proffered gift, we submitted the object to the President and his wife and a decision was easily arrived at. But since the creation of the Commission on the Rehabilitation of the White House, there seem to be two conflicting authorities and I would really be very glad to have that situation resolved."

Mr. Hudnut said, "It seems to me the Commission in charge of the work should be the one to accept or reject these gifts, or have the entire responsibility."

Mr. Finley asked, "What would you do when that Commission goes out of existence, as it will next year when the White House is finished?"

Mr. Hudnut replied, "After they have finished their work, then I think we could take over."

> Mr. Finley then remarked, "Well, we are experts in Fine Arts matters who give advice, and the Commission on the Rehabilitation of the White House does not consist primarily of such experts. It has engineers, two Senators, among others, and they do not pretend to be experts on matters of this kind. They are professionals on the rebuilding of the White House and I think they would hesitate to accept works of art that are offered unless they had advice from qualified experts."

Mr. Belluschi remarked, "It seems to me that all the furnishings would be a part of the architect's duties, or whoever is in charge, because otherwise we will accept a lot of things that will not be matched. It seems to me that we are more or less deciding object by object, and I don't think that is the right way to go about it."

Chairman Finley replied, "I am inclined to agree with you. I might say that nothing has been accepted, though recommended by this Commission, which has not been approved by the White House itself, which means it goes first to Mr. Crim, who decides whether it fits into the scheme of things, and then to President and Mrs. Truman. They are given an opportunity to pass on everything we recommend. If the Commission on the Rehabilitation of the White House had a set of dishes referred to them, I think they might find themselves at a loss as to how to come to a decision."

Mr. Belluschi remarked, "But chairs, davenports and chandeliers, it seems to me by acceptance we put the stamp of approval on something that might not really be approved in its final acceptance."

Mr. Neild suggested, "If we would express our approval or recommend acceptance, a place might be found for each of these objects."

Mr. Finley commented on this by saying, "That is all we do. We only recommend acceptance. We advise as to whether it seems to be a suitable object for the White House. If it is not needed, Mr. Crim advises rejection. I would be very glad if there were some centralized authority to accept these gifts. I might say it is a great deal of trouble, every time somebody offers a chair or the like to have to circularize the members of the Fine Arts Commission; yet the donors want a decision and so does the White House."

Mr. Hudnut remarked, "I think it is a matter of saying the thing is a good piece of work. We had better delegate the job of saying so to you and get rid of all this detail." Thereupon Mr. Hudnut offered the following motion:

The Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts is to be a Committee of One, associating with himself other members of the Commission if he wishes to do so, who shall act as a Subcommittee for the Commission.

On motion, properly moved and seconded, the above Resolution was adopted.

Mr. Finley thanked the Commission for this action, saying that it will simplify matters very much, and that, when the Commission appointed by Congress for the Rehabilitation of the White House has completed its work, a Subcommittee on White House Furnishings, as formerly constituted, may be appointed to act for the Commission of Fine Arts in this matter.

5. BUST OF HARRY B. MITCHELL: Under date of March 14th a letter was received from Mr. Cecil E. Custer, of the Civil Service Commission (Exhibit C) with which he submitted a miniature bust of Former Chairman Harry B. Mitchell, of the United States Civil Service Commission, by Mrs. Jessie Lincoln, of Sacramento, California. The model was brought to the particular attention of Mr. deWeldon. It is to be full size, in bronze, and will be placed in the Civil Service Commission Building, at 8th and F Streets, N. W.

Mr. de Feldon, after inspecting the model, said, "I suggest we inspect the life-sized model. This does not seem to be too good. It might be a good likeness, but it has no quality." Mr. de Feldon remarked that it can be done in clay, and if the work is satisfactory, the sculptor can go from there to bronze.

Mr. Belluschi said, "It is a difficult decision. The likeness may be good, but when it comes to the question of likeness and art, very few artists can do it well."

Mr. Biddle remarked, "For me, it is a question of decision of sentiment against any kind of artistic value."

Thereupon, on motion properly moved and seconded, the Commission decided to recommend a full-sized clay model of the bust (Exhibit C-1).

6. REVISED DESIGN FOR THE FRANCIS SCOTT KEY FLAGPOLE: The Secretary presented a revised design for this flagpole, received from the Office of National Capital Parks.

Mr. Peets stated that the design had been prepared at his request after conference with Mr. Merel S. Sager, Chief of the Division of Design of that Office; that he had ruled out the flagpole motif suggested on account of bad traffic conditions at the site; that he had recommended instead a simple memorial of the "marker" type.

Mr. Peets and the other members of the Commission did not consider the revised design to be satisfactory, and this view was confirmed later in the day when an inspection of the site was made. It was thought the marker, which will indicate the location of the home of Francis Scott Key, should be made more conspicuous and that the grounds should possibly be given a simple terrace treatment.

The Commission referred the matter to Mr. Peets for further conference with Mr. Sager.

7. CLEANING THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT BUILDING: Under date of March 7, 1951, the following letter was received:

1908 Florida Ave., N.W.
Washington, D. C.

Chairman
Commission of Fine Arts
Washington, D. C.

"In a letter dated August 4, 1950, Mr. Caemmerer, Secretary of your Commission, wrote me that my letter regarding the cleaning of the filthy exterior walls of the U. S. Treasury building would be presented to members of your Commission. I shall appreciate hearing from you regarding this matter.

Very truly yours,
William Huntington."

Chairman Finley was of the opinion that the question of cleaning the building depended on whether or not the Treasury Department has the money to have the work done. Mr. Hadnut said, "It depends on whether you think it is going to affect the building any; if they are going to roughen the stone work, take the edges off and that sort of thing, as in sandblasting."

Mr. Belluschi remarked, "They have been cleaning buildings with steam and some kind of acid. It keeps them just as clean, without having to sandblast them."

Mr. Neild objected to sandblasting, saying "It could be cleaned by washing it without damage. The building has been damaged by birds. I suppose that is what has caused this objection."

Mr. de Teldon remarked, "The Treasury is built of granite. I think steam heat and a little acid will clean it without damaging."

Mr. Biddle asked, "Will it change the color very much?" Mr. Belluschi replied, "It will probably make it shine. I have not inspected the building closely. I do not know. I think it is a strange sentimental quirk that makes

us afraid to clean buildings."

The Commission decided to interpose no objection to having the cleaning done, provided a method is used that will not injure the stone, and provided further that, after the cleaning is done, the building will not look objectionable (Exhibit E).

8. GANDHI MEMORIAL: Chairman Finley submitted the following letter that he received from Senator Theodore F. Green, Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library:

March 8, 1951

> "The Joint Committee on the Library at a meeting on March 7th considered the proposed location selected by the National Commission of Fine Arts for the site of the memorial to the memory of Mohandas K. Gandhi (Public Law 309, 81st Congress).
>
> "The location selected by the Commission is at present under private ownership and would have to be purchased by the Government before any memorial could be erected thereon. The Attorney General has interpreted Public Law 309, 81st Congress, to mean that public land in the District of Columbia is to be used for the memorial, and the Joint Committee agreed unanimously that the site selected for this memorial should be on public land that is presently available. Therefore, the Commission is requested to reconsider its action."

The Commission discussed the subject and later in the day inspected a heretofore suggested location near the India Embassy, adjacent to Rock Creek Park. It was noted that at that site there is a tract comprising 1.2 acres of park land, 1.8 acres in private ownership, and 2 acres of India Embassy grounds, which would make a total of 5 acres, or the amount of land that the Mahatma Gandhi Memorial Committee desires for the memorial.

The matter was referred to the National Park Service and to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission (Exhibit E), and Mr. Singh was advised accordingly (Exhibit E-1). See also Exhibit E-2.

9. MEMORANDUM ON "THE BASIS OF JUDGMENT IN MONUMENTALITY": The Commission considered a Memorandum on this subject that had been submitted by Prof.

Hudnut for consideration (Exhibit F).

Chairman Finley said, "I thought it an excellent statement. This gives an opportunity for any one to add to it and to express their views."

Prof. Hudnut asked, "Should we make a statement or not?" Mr. Heild replied, "I would say yes. It is a matter of policy. Mr. Hudnut in paragraph six makes it very plain that these are not requirements, but the basis for clearance, and certainly the principles are excellent. I would be in favor of distributing them."

Mr. Peets said, "It is a difficult situation, since a judgment in favor of not making such a statement would be construed as a statement that this draft doesn't accomplish the purpose. I think that I will have to vote that for the present, avoiding the question head on, I question against the issuance of the statement. I believe that I was one of those who favored doing so at the last meeting. I don't desire to say it is impossible, but I think that much more work would have to be done on it, more exchange of points of view, and if possible, a trial run or so with some of our architect friends before the statement was issued."

Mr. Hudnut replied, "That was taken for granted. This is just offered as a basis of discussion. This doesn't affect the question of policy as to whether we should issue a statement or not. I think we would save time if we made up our minds first if we wanted to issue a statement. If we said yes, we could issue this as a basis for discussion."

Mr. Finley asked, "Was it in the minds of the Commission at first that we should formulate a statement of this kind for our own guidance and the guidance ~~xxxx~~ of architects who come here, if they asked to have something specific pointed out? If we had such a statement of principles, I think it would be useful in specific cases of architects who come to us.

"I am a little dubious as to issuing it to the world as a statement from the Commission of Fine Arts as to what architecture should be. We are asked about specific cases that come before the Commission, requiring our views as to something that is going to be built or designed for the Government. We are not formulating principles by which the art world is to be governed, and I would not wish our statement to be construed in that way."

Mr. Peets remarked that he was in favor of a statement, and Mr. Biddle suggested clarification of the problem.

Continuing, Mr. Finley said, "If it is issued to the newspapers, etc., as a statement of the Commission of Fine Arts, are we setting ourselves up as a court of last resort? We have never done that kind of thing. It seems to me our function is to advise in specific cases. This statement would be very useful if we want to say to Mr. Justement, for instance, 'Your design doesn't meet certain requirements, and here is a statement of them'. I think we should consider carefully issuing manifestoes to the world because we may only get the Commission, itself, into controversies, which is not really our function."

Mr. Hudnut replied, "We should not give this to anybody, especially if they wish to attack it, so we take a risk in issuing it to the public. It means somebody is going to print it some time."

Mr. Neild suggested that the prelude indicates this statement is for the information of architects who seek approval of their designs by the Fine Arts Commission.

Mr. Biddle said, "If I could slightly broaden the point of view, I know in the realm of painters and sculptors and in connection with that it would be a question of publicizing the other question of policy in choosing paintings and sculpture; that our position would be enormously strengthened among all the

painters and sculptors of America if we could issue some statement of liberal and independent and honest selection and publicize it in such magazines as the Art Digest, or Architectural Forum, which are generally speaking only read by professionals, and it would be with that point of view that I would love to see some sort of publicizing of our general policy, or method of selection; something of that sort, and then of course, it would be a question of very careful revision of the interpretation of whatever we publish."

Chairman Finley asked, "Would you publish the names of the painters and sculptors that are on the list?" Mr. Biddle replied, "That would be a question of revision; probably not. As to adding names to the list, that would be a question of policy."

Mr. Belluschi said, "I think it would be dangerous to have a list published. I don't think it would be fair, because it could be changing all the time. I really do think that a manifesto of our own belief, which may be human, after all, with shortcomings, might be necessary for our own presentation as well as the architects. I think we should be, however, very careful in wording. Since it is a function of this Commission to approve, I think people are entitled to know what we think about a design and what our test and yardstick of judgment is.

Mr. Hudnut remarked, "I think we might make a statement of principles as to all the arts with which the Commission is concerned."

"Another thing, this is an historical point that I think is not too important, but the new members of this Commission contains three architects who are suspected of extremely radical views, and if it issues a statement which appears to be sane, or has some sense in it, it might clear the air a little."

Mr. Biddle said, "I think we could say without suggesting names that we will always consult with pleasure any suggestions from leading art bodies or museum directors, or individual artists; that we will listen to their suggestions, or something of that sort, which in no way ties us down. The art world should know that we welcome suggestions."

Chairman Finley said, "I think any member of the Commission should be free to ask suggestions from any organization or individual they choose. For instance, in this list of sculptors and painters, any of the seven members of the Commission ought to come in with the name of any person they think is qualified and let the Commission decide whether or not that is an artist they want to recommend for some particular job. Just last week I had a visit from a sculptor who is very anxious to be included in the list, a man who has done very good work, but he is not on the list. There will be many others like that."

"The Commission has been in existence for 40 years. I don't remember whether it has ever issued any statements or of what kind, but people have been forming their opinion of the Commission on the basis of actions actually taken. They will decide on the record we make as to whether or not we have judgment to recommend the best designs. What I am trying to say is that we have cases that come before us all the time and it is not what we say but what we do that is going to make our reputation and commend us or not to the country. So I think we ought to be very careful about issuing manifestos and relying too much on what is to be accomplished by them."

"I think it is very useful to have lists of qualified painters and sculptors so we can turn to them immediately if we want to recommend one. And I think it is useful to have this excellent statement that we can show to architects or make some use of it."

I am dubious about issuing manifestoes; and, as to the art world in America, if they don't have confidence in this Commission, with the high caliber membership it has now, then I think there is nothing we can say that will make them have confidence in us."

Mr. Belluschi remarked, "I think Mr. Hudnut very justly said that once you make a statement of policy and you issue it to an architect he comes in and wants to know why he was rejected; there might be a chance they would republish it, in which case it would become a manifesto. I don't think it was the intention of having this paper reproduced and saying this is what we believe or don't believe, but I think it is well to have a statement made and be prepared to defend it if it becomes public, which we couldn't help very much it becoming. I think the question is whether we should write a statement. I think if you write a statement you should be prepared to have it publicized in some manner or other later on. That is a very important decision to make."

Mr. Biddle said, "I think it is a question of careful revision. If, for instance in the case of sculptors and painters we were to say we want always to keep our minds open for young talent and had reference to every geographical section of the country, by consultation with different museum directors, etc., I think that in itself would go a long way."

Mr. deWeldon said, "I feel each individual art project will require specific talent and a specific artist to do the job. In one case it will be a very modern artist; in another case a very conservative artist. Therefore, we have to have our minds very open in the selection of such artists."

Thereupon, Mr. Finley asked if this statement is satisfactory in this form.

Mr. Belluschi said, "No, There are two or three points." Mr. Hudnut then asked, "Do you think we should settle first whether or not we should make a statement? It would save time if we say we want or don't want a statement."

Thereupon Mr. Biddle suggested, "Could we approach it realistically by saying, let the architect members prepare a statement for publication, and you, deWeldon, and I prepare a statement regarding painters and sculptors for publication and then submit those on a realistic basis as to whether or not they might be objectionable?"

Chairman Finley concluded the remarks on this subject by saying, "That would be the way to do it. I assume it is the sense of the Commission to prepare a statement that might be published. Suppose we take another month on it and then decide at the next meeting whether or not it should be published."

10. LAW SCHOOL BUILDING, HOWARD UNIVERSITY: Mr. L. L. Hunter, Acting Supervising Architect, Public Buildings Administration, submitted a revised design for the Law School Building of Howard University. Mr. Hunter said,--

> "The Public Buildings service is resubmitting tentative designs for the Law School Building of Howard University for your consideration this morning. Also, we will present for your review the diagrammatic sketches of the Administration Building proposed for Howard University. The architects for both of these buildings are Justement, Elam and Darby. They are represented by Messrs. Elam and Darby.
>
> "The University is represented by its architectural coordinator, Mr. Cook. Mr. Persina, Chief of Design of our Office, is also present. I will ask Mr. Elam to present the drawings, starting with the Law School Building." Mr. Elam said,--
>
> "Gentlemen, at your request, made at the last meeting of this body, we have re-studied the designs for the Law School Building, and would like to submit them at this time. The plot plan, or the general shape of the building has not changed materially. We have spent most of our time in attempting to revise the elevations. We have followed, or tried to take into consideration, suggestions made by this group at its last meeting in considering the new design.

"Our main changes have consisted of the consideration of fenestration and main entrance. We believe the fenestration has now been somewhat unified as compared to the original design.

"We have made a complete new design of the entrance. I don't know whether you recall the design of the other entrance or not. However, we have also attempted to eliminate, or reduce, the number of different kinds of materials used in this building. We have eliminated the limestone, which appeared around the entrance of the original design; we have adopted an entrance of the canopy type; all brick, except the canopy.

"There was criticism at the last meeting of the Commission as to the number of different kinds of windows. We have reduced them to three."

Thereupon Mr. Elam pointed out the main entrance to the library, the general administration office; the librarian's office. The main body of the building is to be in red brick, probably matching the brick already used. The windows come out from the column structure about 18 inches, that is from the wall to the center of the column.

Mr. Belluschi asked, "So your brick is on the structure?" and Mr. Elam replied "Yes."

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Hadnut, seconded by Mr. Neild, the Commission approved the design (Exhibit C).

11. ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, HOWARD UNIVERSITY: Mr. Elam presented the design for this building, saying---

"This building we just presented is represented on this general overall plot plan of the University in green. The building I am about to present is the one represented in red, to give you an idea of the relationship of the two.

Mr. Persins suggested that Mr. Elam inform the Commission about the site conditions for this new building." That Mr. Elam proceeded to do by saying,--

"You understand the bad topo, or the bad grade of the Law School building. On the present site, along Georgia Avenue, as indicated here, where I am pointing, are old residences at a considerable lower level than this part of the property. I believe it is something like a 20 foot drop down to that lower level. This building is a proposed building (between the two

being considered). There (indicating) is Howard Hall, somewhat of a shrine at the University, which the authorities have insisted that we maintain in using the property for the Administration Building, so naturally that has affected our thinking in the design and layout of the Administration Building.

It is the plan to remove several of the old houses to provide for servicing the Administration Building.

A landscape plan of the grounds was then presented, showing the relationship of the new buildings proposed to the existing buildings. The Administration Building will have a sizeable post office in it, called by the Government a substation. Thereupon, on motion properly moved and seconded, the design was approved (Exhibit H).

12. PARKING LOT FOR THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS: Mr. Elam, representing the firm of Justement, Elam and Merry, architects, 2011 K Street, N.W., presented a design for a parking lot on the grounds of the American National Red Cross at 17th and D Streets, N.W. The entrance would be from D Street. A low retaining wall would separate the garden area from a limited paved area, which would be surrounded by planting. A few trees would have to be sacrificed, and the Commission recommended that as many as possible be saved. The parking area is also needed for ambulances.

Mr. Peets wanted to know who is to be the landscape architect for the job, but Mr. Elam didn't know. Thereupon Mr. Peets urged that the plan be checked over by someone competent in landscape work. Upon being asked by the Chairman as to whether or not he would recommend approval, Mr. Peets said "Yes." Thereupon the Commission approved the design (Exhibit I).

13. SCULPTOR FOR THE AMERICAN MILITARY CEMETERY AT TUNIS (CARTHAGE), NORTH AFRICA: Under date of March 17, 1951, the following letter was received from Mr. John P. Harbeson, Consulting Architect of the American Battle Monuments Commission:

"On behalf of Moore and Hutchins, Architects of the American Military Memorial at Carthage, North Africa, we send for consideration and approval by your Commission as their collaborating Sculptor on this project the name of Henry Kreis, of Essex, Connecticut.

"We enclose an exhibit of his work, including the 'Birth of a Nation' (Declaration of Independence) at the Samuel Memorial, carved (by himself) in limestone, and models for four subjects in high relief for the Virginia Polytechnic Institute War Memorial, for which we are architects.

"As consulting architects to the Battle Monuments Commission we highly endorse this selection by the project architects.

"When the exhibit of work has served its purpose will you please send it to General North, Secretary of American Battle Monuments Commission?"

It was noted that the name of Henry Kreis is on the tentative list of sculptors chosen for future work of the Government. Mr. deWeldon said that he is familiar with Mr. Kreis's work, and would consider him competent but that models of the work proposed should be submitted.

Chairman Finley agreed that it is proper to ask for sketches. However, "We would have an opportunity to pass on the sketches but we wouldn't have an opportunity to change the contract once it was let, so if we approve him (Mr. Kreis) as a competent sculptor, we could request he submit sketches."

Thereupon, the Commission approved the selection of Mr. Kreis as the sculptor for this project (Exhibit J).

14. PAINTER FOR THE AMERICAN MILITARY CEMETERY AT ST. LAURENT (Omaha Beach Head), FRANCE: Brig. Gen. Thomas North, Secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission, presented a design for the development of this Cemetery and discussed the subject with the Commission, particularly the question of choosing a competent painter for the project. General North said,--

"This is Omaha Beach. Here are the bluffs where we came ashore. These are the grave plots (indicating). Here is a memorial. Behind it is the so-called garden of the missing, on the walls of which were inscribed the names of the missing and down here (indicating) at the intersection of the main arms of the cross a small circular chapel.

The memorial itself is here (indicating) and the reflecting pool in front of it, and this was the design for it as shown in the picture. The statue is being done by Mr. DeLue. Its size is fifteen feet high, which gives you some idea of the scale. It is the project of the American Battle Monuments Commission to show by maps in some common medium--we are using mosaic in some places and other mediums in other cemeteries--the achievements of the troops by means of maps and these maps are the ones I think for which Mr. Harbeson is seeking approval of the designer or painter."

Mr. Biddle asked, "Would it be possible, General, to have some monumental mural painting instead of just maps?"

General North replied, "Well, sir, that would be a little foreign to the project, which is to that extent at least uniform throughout our work. You see we are the American Battle Monuments Commission. Our work primarily is monumenting the achievements of the Forces, but it has become merged into that of developing the permanent cemeteries.

After the First World War, we put a monument upon each battlefield, and a cemetery close by. Today, we are no longer putting monuments on the battlefields, and we are merging the two things; for that reason we feel that a mere work of art, so to speak, as opposed to a graphic record of achievements would perhaps not be quite so appropriate. The two are combined.

At Epinal, France, Mr. Savage is doing a mosaic fifty-four feet long, which does combine, if I may use the term, art work with a map. Figures of one sort or another are put into those portions of the map where military action is not significant. Symbolic figures are being used."

Mr. Biddle said, "They are permissive. Would that be alternated with maps?"

General North replied, "The space would not altogether permit it. We have here six walls. One of them at least must have an inscription in words of what took place. On another wall, we would show the landings on these beaches, which are within a quarter of a mile of you. You look down over them. That takes one wall. There will be shown possibly in perspective a map showing where each major units landed, such as First Division, Twenty-ninth Division, possibly even down to regiments. That would be maps."

"I now have accounted for two of our six walls. On the third wall we want to show the general development of our operations until the defeat of the Germans over in Germany, so there is an over-all map of Western Europe. That would be a map. Then in addition what we had planned is to show the air plan, too, of cooperation, which is a very interesting thing if you have never seen it, and then the Naval plan. But I am perfectly willing to admit that you might feel, (and I would be delighted to submit it to General Marshall) that we would be having too much map and that possibly something else might take the place of one or both of those others."

Mr. Biddle conferred with Mr. Hudnut, and said, "Would you not like the reconsideration of allotment of space in some way to permit monumental symbolic figures or something of that sort and your own figures alternating with the maps?"

Mr. Hudnut replied, "I should ordinarily, but I somehow feel here maps would be eloquent and perhaps they should be decorated with symbols."

Mr. Biddle. Could they come on top of reliefs? Just something to relieve that decorative monotony?

Mr. Hudnut. Well, I must say I am a little bit in favor of the maps at this moment. It seems to me they would tell the story differently."

General North, continuing, said: "There are six spaces and I have described five to you; the sixth I have not described. One of those five is descriptive matter. The sixth is another scheme we had to go to, because when your boy goes there with you and he says, 'Yes, you were up at Bastogne, but your cousin Joe, he was at Iwo Jima.' Well, what did that have to do with this thing? We are therefore showing in a series of six key maps the relation in time and space of all of the major events of the war. Each different map is to fit each particular space."

Mr. Biddle remarked, "Then the only thing the artist does is the translating of this map into a medium, whatever it is, mosaic and so forth, and color?"

General North, "It is a little more than that. You see, we can give the painter a map showing what the forces did, and it would be rendered in a way that would be pleasing to the eye."

Mr. Hudnut felt it is about as difficult an assignment as an artist could have.

Chairman Finley then suggested that the Commission send to General North the names of at least one or two men competent for this work.

General North said, in conclusion, "We thought of mosaic, but I have inquired in Europe about them. The only outdoor mosaics exposed to salt air of which I have knowledge are those at St. Mark's, and last week we received information from Europe which makes us a little doubtful about mosaics. There is at LeHavre a panel in mosaic which has been cracked. We think that may be due to war action, but we are now beginning to think that mosaic is not the medium. We are not sure. Those breezes that come off the sea carrying the salt water with them could damage them."

Mr. Neild asked, "Would this be fresco?"

General North replied, "I would be awfully afraid of fresco. It is right on the edge of a bluff overlooking the English Channel."

At the urgent request of General North that the Commission recommend a painter for St. Laurent without further delay, since it involves the question of a contract for the Memorial, the Secretary took up the matter with Mr. Biddle and Prof. Hudnut, who recommended Ben Shahn, Anton Refregier and Gregory Kepes. The other members of the Commission, unanimously, concurred in this recommendation and General North was advised accordingly (Exhibit K).

15. RESIDENCE 2432 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N. W.: Mr. Neild said he wished to discuss the design for this building before the architect, Mr. Dixon, takes it up with the Commission. Mr. Neild said:

> "This design is for a house on Massachusetts Avenue. I went out yesterday to inspect the site. We objected to the design submitted at our last meeting, if you remember. I would object to it again, because of the small cross section of the stone on the front and the weather boarding particularly.
>
> The design has a unit that is required in that area. I would like to get the opinion of this Commission as to how far we should go in residence design. If it were a public building, of course, we wouldn't stop at anything that was considered not best. I don't think this is the best type of residence design. I haven't heard from Mr. Belluschi of Mr. Hudnut. How far could we go?"

Mr. Belluschi said, "Well, the fact that it comes to the Commission for approval I think should be enough. It doesn't make too much difference whether it is a big or small building. Perhaps houses shouldn't come to this Commission."

The Secretary stated that the Shipstead-Luce Act includes designs for residences, and this design is submitted in compliance with the law. He pointed out that the rear of this building faces Rock Creek Parkway, but in the submission of a design the Commission of Fine Arts have taken the entire building into consideration. Mr. Belluschi thought this was the right thing to do.

In the meantime the following report has been received from Mr. Hudnut; that he and Mr. Belluschi examined the plans:

February 28, 1951

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

> We have examined the revised plans for Mr. and Mrs. Gustave Ring's residence and find that the rear elevation facing the Park is quite acceptable. It has the kind of unity which we miss very much in the front elevation.
>
> We are at a loss to understand the reasons for introducing wood siding in the short sections and also we feel uncomfortable about the different scale used for the main entrance. The four slender columns, barely 8 inches square, seem to soar to a height of 20 feet, and tend to break up the unity of the elevation.

It may be desirable to discuss the matter again with the architect to see if he has any comments on our objections.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph Hudnut

The Secretary said the architect was informed of these criticisms and proposed to make a model of the building for this meeting, but this he has not done. Thereupon the architect, F. Wallace Dixon, entered the room.

Mr. Neild, speaking for the Commission of Fine Arts, said: "Mr. Dixon we object to the stone columns and the weather boarding on the Massachusetts Avenue front and we therefore request a re-study on the Massachusetts Avenue side. We would prefer that the columns and weather boarding be omitted on the design. The rear of the house with its garden treatment is much more pleasing to us."

Mr. Dixon replied: "I would like to explain how it was developed. It is a little bit of a compromise, which these kind of jobs are with the owner. He saw a similar house in California which he liked, and that is the result. The columns, I think on that California house, were wood, and of course he didn't want to use wood on the columns, although he did use them on the spans; we were going to make them about 2' x 15, a little deeper than they are wide, although the plan probably doesn't show it that way. We have the detail of that. The wood on the span board on each side was to try to accept the center part, which was to keep the center part verticle and the rest horizontal. That is all I can say for or against it."

Mr. Neild said, "We feel a restudy would probably result in quite an improvement, considering the columns and the weather boarding."

The Commission then agreed to recommend to the Director of Inspections of the District of Columbia that Mr. Dixon be granted a permit to proceed with the project, excepting the Massachusetts Avenue front, for which the Commission requested a revised design from the architect. Action was taken accordingly, and it was agreed that a set of the revised blueprints for the Massachusetts Avenue front would be sent to the architect members of the Commission as soon as received from the architect, (Exhibit I).

16. HOWARD JOHNSON RESTAURANT, at NORTH CAPITOL STREET AND MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N. W.: The Howard Johnson Restaurant Company, through their architect, Mr. Chico, submitted a revised design for their proposed restaurant at this location. Mr. Chico said that, in accordance with a suggestion of the Secretary, he had conferred with Prof. Hudnut and with Prof. Belluschi, in Cambridge, and that they had approved the design. It is proposed to remodel an existing old restaurant building at the site, the cost of building an entirely new structure being considered prohibitive by the Company at this time. Mr. Chico also submitted a perspective of the proposed building. It is to resemble the standard Howard Johnson Restaurant built in many cities. Mr. Chico explained details of the interior arrangement.

Mr. Peets objected to the color of the orange tile roof, as did also Prof. Hudnut.

Mr. Belluschi remarked, "Mr. Biddle suggested that perhaps you could consider natural tile, Mexican tile, or the Mercedes tile."

Mr. Chico replied, "We have never used it. Of course, one of our main reasons, along with this, is the roof being a trade mark it has that glazing on it. We arrived at the style of roof because the color orange was established by the Company as a trade mark; but so much grease and soot from adjacent

buildings gets on the roof that it loses color in time. It has been a maintenance problem. Years ago we used asphalt but that would curl up. This is a porcelain tile made by Wolverine of Detroit, and it is put on every one of our buildings."

Mr. Belluschi felt it would be a great improvement to use the shingle form instead of their customary tile roof. "The Heintz people used to make a most beautiful orange shingle, but it was a natural variation and I think once you had that maybe you would change and use it."

The Commission, thereupon, approved the design, subject to resubmission of sample material for the roof.

As for the advertising sign, this is to be similar to the "Williamsburg" sign approved some months ago for the Howard Johnson Restaurant along the Rock Creek Parkway.

17. MISCELLANEOUS SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSION: Advertising sign for 404 Twelfth Street, N. W. (Corner of 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue). Under date of March 14, 1951, an application, No. 1416, was received for a neon sign at this corner in the form of Mexican dancing figures drawn in neon tubing to advertise a dancing school on the second floor of the building.

The Commission considered the design to be spectacular and badly drawn, and disapproved it. A report was sent to the Office of the Director of Inspection of the District of Columbia accordingly.

18. SUBMISSION UNDER THE "OLD GEORGETOWN ACT": (a) The Secretary presented an advertising sign for a Safeway Grocery Store at 1901 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. received under date of March 14, 1951 (Application No. O. G. 88). It is to be a two-faced Neon sign, to be placed at the corner of their building, and to replace two existing signs, one on each side of their building.

The Commission noted that the new sign would be more than 25 square feet in area, measuring in fact fully 40 square feet. The design was disapproved, therefore; also a sign of that type was not considered to be appropriate for a location near a residential area. The Director of Inspection of the District of Columbia was advised accordingly.

(b) The Secretary reported difficulties that are being encountered through submissions under the "Old Georgetown Act" by the Committee of Architects. The submissions number now nearly 100 (99 to be exact) and they are requiring a meeting of the architects every week. There have also been certain irregularities discovered that have made necessary a letter to the Director of Inspection on the subject. Accordingly, Chairman Finley sent a letter to the Director of Inspection calling attention to these difficulties (Exhibit M) and suggesting requirements in future procedure.

19. PAINTERS FOR THE WAR IN KOREA: Mr. Biddle said:

"Very briefly, the suggestion to have the Army use war correspondents in Korea overseas has run into one of those red tape difficulties and I think it will have to be taken up with a higher level by you (Mr. Finley) or by the Committee if we are going through with it.

"General Marshall wrote me in answer to my letter asking an appointment to discuss the matter, 'I recall the fine work which your art committee did during World War II.' This indicates I think that he and President Truman are favorable to the idea of having a record made by artists of our fighting divisions. He suggests that I contact his Director of Public Information, Mr. Osgood Roberts, and discuss the question with him. After some correspondence with Mr. Roberts the matter was turned over to Colonel Frank Doran, who seems to have taken Robert's place as Chief of the Bureau of the Public Information Division. (reading) "I attach a copy of the letter from Colonel Doran, stating his position (1) That he feels it impossible to send artists on a contract basis at present, as I had suggested, since during World War II Congress withdrew the funds for a similar project, organized under the Engineers/in compliance with a directive from General Somervelle."

Now that briefly means, I think, that the only effective way to start this program would be to get some sort of a directive on a high level from the Army to say that they were interested in this project and go ahead with it.

(reading) "(2) He felt arrangements could be made by reputable periodicals such as Life with individual artists on the same contract basis as with accredited war correspondents."

That briefly means that the Army channels the correspondent artists to the front and supports them while they are working and the magazine makes a separate contract with each individual artist correspondent.

I took up this matter with Look, Life and Colliers and actually only two artists have been sent to Korea by these magazines as it was felt on an editorial policy level that photographs were sufficient for their news coverage.

That is the reality of the situation. From the magazine point of view they find the photograph fills the bill, and that cuts out any possibility of having an artist for historical record.

To sum up, the whole matter has bogged down in lower echelon red tape. I believe that the President and General Marshall are interested in the possibility of a pictorial war record, commensurate with the work done during World War II by our War Department Art Committee, which was subsequently taken over by "Life" as were similar organizations under the French, English, German and Japanese army.

It can be emphasized here that we are practically the only major country in the world that has no such facilities for the pictorial war record

The Commission should determine the advisability of again exploring the whole matter at some higher Defense Department level. Similar programs were carried out during World War II under various appropriate set-ups by the Marines, the Navy and by some of our contract units under a permissive directive from General Eisenhower.

"I should note here that the War Department Art Committee in the last War only operated with the Army but not with the Marines, Air Force and Navy. They had different programs. Now, deFeldon, do you have a word to say about the approaches you have made with these other organizations, namely, Marines, Air Force, etc.?"

Mr. deFeldon reported, as follows: "I contacted the head of Public Information of all four branches of the service. I saw General Parks, of the Army; I saw Colonel Eisenhart of the Air Force, in the absence of General Smith, who was away on a trip, and I saw Admiral Heffernan of the Navy, and I saw General McQueen of the Marine Corps, and they all are very highly in favor of doing war art, but the only possibility of doing it that they saw because of the appropriation difficulties would be to commission the artist into the services.

"Therefore, they could be absorbed by the present appropriations. It would result in the difficulty of asking for an appropriation from Congress. Actually the Marine Corps has in effect artists groups in Korea, which consist of four men; one commissioned officer, a competent officer, one non-commissioned officer, who is an artist, and one photographer to help to take historical

records, where the seriousness of the battle does not afford an artist time to sketch right away, and one helper to carry the equipment and get supplies and so forth. There are four men in each division. The Navy is working on a program to reactivate their reserve artists.

"I had a very favorable interview with General Parks. He is head of Public Information, and also with Colonel Eisenhart, and when General Smith of the Air Force came back, Colonel Eisenhart called me and said General Smith is highly in favor of the project.

"Then I had an interview with Mr. Fritchie, who coordinates all the public relations of the four Armed Services for General Marshall and he said he would have a meeting. They have combined meetings every Friday, when all the different reports of the four branches are put in written form. They would have a combined meeting, which I should attend, and then they can get the combined policy, but that meeting has not come about, and it is now over six weeks. I am still waiting to hear from them. I tried to call Mr. Fritchie the other day but he was impossible to reach."

Mr. Biddle asked, "In the case of the Marines and Navy, are these commissioned artists doing military work besides?"

Mr. deWeldon replied, "No. But they had to be competent in the military in order not to endanger their own lives. They had a full-time job."

Mr. Biddle remarked, "That is what the Army has turned down for the moment and that is why I am convinced they could do it if you took it up at the higher level again."

Mr. deWeldon said, "It actually needs more leadership from General Marshall. The Marines and Navy could do it on their own, but the aim in the Defense Department is to have a unified policy, which can be done under an orderly plan, while the details would be worked out in the four different branches. It would be necessary to take it up on General Marshall's level. I think, Mr. Finley, it would be best if you would write a letter to General Marshall. In the absence of General Marshall, the White House called Mr. Fritchie, because it is the President's policy to reactivate war art."

"One of the important questions which came up was what should be done with the works of art after they are completed. There were so many paintings that were done in World War II and nobody sees them now. I made the suggestion that the best works should be loaned to the different museums all over the country and to schools and public buildings." This brought up the subject of ---

20. WAR ART MUSEUMS: Mr. Finley said, "The museums would undoubtedly borrow the paintings, but wouldn't show them indefinitely. After the last War a Commission was appointed, of which I was Chairman, to make a recommendation for the permanent display of these works of art, and especially with the idea that a war art museum would be built in Washington. We have such a report, which we sent to the White House over three years ago, recommending a museum be built here on the waterfront, in an area comprising 50 acres, adjacent to the War College. It would include Army, Navy, Marine and Air, and in that museum would be shown these paintings."

"One of the men in Life magazine talked to me a number of times. He is very anxious to know what he should do with that collection of paintings. I am not able to make a recommendation to him because I know of no place where I could guarantee him they would be permanently displayed. I am very sorry about this war museum. The plans were carefully thought out."

Mr. Biddle said he talked with the gentleman the other day and he thought there was some chance of that going through, that is to build a war museum. Mr. Finley remarked, "I wish it might go through, but I think it is unlikely at this moment."

Thereupon Mr. Biddle asked, "Would you think it as advisable to take it up with General Marshall and ask him if you could see him about it; get deWeldon to write you a short memorandum of what he has just said and I could give you a short memorandum on that of what I have found out, so you would have that information at hand?"

Chairman Finley replied, "Yes; I would like to have a memorandum reciting how this was carried on in the Navy and Marine Corps at the present time and suggesting that the same method could be followed in the Army, and then we could ask General Marshall if he would take similar action."

Mr. deWeldon remarked, the four branches are in favor of this, but it is bogged down in red tape and unification policy. All that is needed is a phone call from General Marshall to Mr. Dritchie saying "Go ahead." Actually each Division would not need more than four men, which of a Division of 14,000 men, four men don't seem to me to upset the budget of a Division.

Chairman Finley said, "Then if you would send me the memorandum, I will be glad to incorporate that in a letter to General Marshall.

"In the last War the Commission on War Art recommended qualified artists, who were sent out to the various battle fronts. Mr. Biddle was Chairman of the Commission."

Mr. Biddle said, "Half of the artists were commissioned and half were non-commissioned. They worked on a contract basis with the Army and it could be reactivated on that basis if they wanted to. When the project was finally turned down by Congress in the last War, what happened was that General Marshall and General Eisenhower issued individual directives allowing the different field commanders to do as they wanted to in using what had formerly been the commissioned artists report. In other words, in some fronts the artists were allowed to continue doing paintings, which shows that the Army can do when it wants to. It feels it is good for the service."

Mr. deWeldon suggested "It would probably be best that the artists be actually in the Service, because then it does not create any budget problem and they are under military command, which will protect their lives and they actually don't have to perform any military duty." Mr. Biddle agreed that that would be the simplest way. "The Army is big enough now so they would have no trouble finding competent artists among the enlisted men."

In conclusion, Chairman Finley said, "I will be delighted to see General Marshall, if you send me the memorandum, and we will start work on the War museum later."

21. FREER GALLERY OF ART: The Commission visited the Freer Gallery of Art to inspect certain objects of art proposed for purchase by the Gallery. The Commission, after inspection of the , approved them (Exhibit N).

Mr. Wenley, Director, presented each member of the Commission with a booklet describing one of the most important works of art, in Egyptian sculpture, in the Freer Gallery, and it was gratefully received (Exhibit O).

22. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: Chairman Finley called attention to the Agenda for Tuesday, March 20th, which, in accordance with the wishes of the President, will be devoted to the subject, generally, of "Government and Art." The proceedings of the day will be made a part of these Minutes (See Exhibit P).

As to a meeting of the Commission in April, the 25th and 26th of April were tentatively agreed to. Chairman Finley reported that he and Mr. Gaillard recently appeared before a Subcommittee on Appropriations in Congress regarding a Deficiency Appropriation for the Commission and their action is awaited.

The Commission adjourned at 5:30 p.m. to meet Tuesday, March 20th, at 10:00 a.m.

C O P Y

Mrs. Ira Nelson Morris
944 Fifth Avenue
New York

March 28, 1951

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman
The Fine Arts Commission
Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

Referring to your letter of March 21st, I understand that the Commission have unanimously approved the acceptance of the porcelain which I wish to present to the White House.

I am now awaiting further instructions as to the transportation of the same from my home in Manchester, Massachusetts to Washington; also as to the exact address where the six barrels and one case containing the porcelain are to be sent.

Hoping to hear from Mr. Crim in the near future,

Yours sincerely,

/s/
Mrs. Ira Nelson Morris

EXHIBIT A

to be added later

EXHIBIT B

D R A F T

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
Washington 25, D. C.

March 14, 1951

Mr. A. E. Demmerer,
Secretary and Administrative Officer,
Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Caemmerer.

In recognition of the distinguished career of Chairman Harry S. Mitchell, the employees of the United States Civil Service Commission desire to purchase and present to the United States Government through the Public Buildings Service a life size statue mounted upon an appropriate pedestal. We propose that this statue be cast in bronze.

Mrs. Jessie Lincoln of Sacramento, California is the artist selected to make the casting model. For your information Mrs. Lincoln has heretofore been selected by the Commission appointed by Governor J. M. Erickson of Montana to make a statue of the late Charles Marion Russell, which statue is to be placed in Statuary Hall in the United States Capitol Building.

We are submitting herewith a miniature bust of Chairman Mitchell, done by Mrs. Lincoln. This miniature is similar to the one which the employees of the United States Civil Service Commission propose to purchase. It is submitted for the use of the Commission of Fine Arts in arriving at its decision.

It is respectfully requested that the Commission of Fine Arts favorably consider this proposal of the employees of the United States Civil Service Commission. When the miniature has served its purpose we will be glad to call for same.

Sincerely yours,

/s/
Cecil E. Dutton, Chief
Budget & Finance Division

EXHIBIT C

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington, DC

March 20, 1951

Dear Mr. Custer:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on March 19, 1951, gave careful consideration to your letter of March 14th, and to the miniature bust of Former Chairman Harry B. Mitchell, of the United States Civil Service Commission, by Mrs. Jessie Lincoln, of Sacramento, California. The model was brought to the particular attention of the sculptor member of the Commission, Mr. Felix W. de Weldon.

The Commission felt that for sentimental reasons the miniature model might be considered acceptable. However, it is noted that the bust is to be life size and to be cast in bronze. Therefore, the Commission of Fine Arts recommend that the artist be requested to make a full-size clay model, so as to give assurance that the bronze bust will be a work of art. The full-size model will bring out detail that is not evident in the miniature model.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Cordially yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. Cecil A. Custer, Chief
Budget and Finance Division
United States Civil Service Commission
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C-1

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington, DC

March 20, 1951

Dear Mr. Demaray:

Attached hereto is a copy of a letter received from Senator Green, Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, with regard to a proposed site for the Gandhi Memorial.

You will note that the Committee does not propose taking action with regard to purchasing a site on East Capitol Street, but asks that reconsideration be given to choosing public grounds for the Memorial.

Therefore, will you please reconsider this matter and advise the Commission of Fine Arts of your recommendation.

A similar letter has been sent to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

Sincerely yours,

David L. Finley,
Chairman.

Hon. A. E. Demaray
Acting Director
National Park Service
Department of the Interior
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT D

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]

March 30, 1951

Dear Sirs:

Attached hereto is a copy of a letter received from Senator Green, Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, with regard to a proposed site for the Gandhi Memorial.

You will note that the Committee does not propose taking action with regard to purchasing a site on East Capitol Street, but asks that consideration be given to choosing public grounds for the Memorial.

Therefore, will you please reconsider this matter and advise the Commission of the title of your recommendation?

A similar letter has been sent to the National Park Service.

Sincerely yours,

David L. Finley,
Chairman.

National Capital Park and
Planning Commission
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT E

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington, DC

March 21, 1951

Dear Mr. Singh:

I am pleased to inform you that, at a meeting held on March 19, 1951, the Commission of Fine Arts decided to give further study to the question of location of the proposed memorial to Mahatma Gandhi, as suggested by Senator Lehman in behalf of the Joint Committee on the Library.

We are conferring with the National Park Service and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the subject, and hope to be able to send you a report in the near future.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. J. I. Singh, President
India League of America
40 East 49th Street
New York 17, N. Y.

EXHIBIT L-1

COPY

[illegible]
40 East 49th Street
New York 17, N.Y.

March 27, 1951

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman
The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

Thank you for your kind letters of March 14 and March 21.

I too had received a letter from Senator Green informing me that the Joint Committee on the Library did not feel inclined to purchase land for the proposed Mahatma Gandhi Memorial in Washington.

Frankly, this decision of the Joint Committee on the Library has come as a great disappointment to us. My colleagues and I feel that the East Capitol Street, in view of the planned development, would have been most suitable for this memorial.

Is it not a fact that the Federal Government intends to purchase all land on the East Capitol Street in connection with the widening of the street as well as the development scheme. If that is so, then would not this land become public land and thus meet with the ruling given by the Attorney General?

I trust that some suitable decision will soon be reached because, as I mentioned in my previous letters, we cannot proceed with our plans for the erection of the memorial until and unless the question of the site has been definitely decided upon.

Thank you for your continued cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

/s/
J.J. Singh, President

JJS:dn

EXHIBIT E-2

MEMORANDUM

from the Commission of Fine Arts

The Bases of Judgement in Architecture

For the information of those architects who will seek the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts for buildings to be built in Washington -- and for its own guidance -- the Commission has attempted to define in the following paragraphs some principles of design which are essential to architectural excellence. The definition, obviously, relates chiefly to the exterior aspects of buildings since these are the primary concern of the Commission.

1. Except in buildings which are definitely monumental in character the exterior patterns of buildings should be developed from interior patterns of space.
   The unity of interior and exterior pattern thus established should be made evident in every aspect of the building, nor should there be added to the building any elements which obscure or bring into question the essential harmony of enclosed space and its outward envelope.

2. In every building the patterns of internal space should be so contrived, whenever that is practicable, as to permit on the exterior shapes of buildings an explicit exhibition of their important components and the essential relationships which exist among these.
   When, for example, a building contains several types of rooms, some large and some small, some of general use and others specialized in use, these should be enclosed, not in a single cube, but in a number of blocks, each block having a shape specific to its purpose. These blocks should then be assembled in such a way as to set forth whatever hierarchy of function or dignity may exist among them.

3. The exterior envelopes thus organized should clearly reveal not only the dimensions and shapes of the spaces they enclose, but the essential natures of the materials and structures of which such envelopes are made.
   The exterior character given to a room, or group of rooms, should be determined not only by the shape and dimensions of such rooms but by the properties of brick, stone, steel and glass, and by the ways in which these are shaped and assembled in walls and columns, girders, vaults and trusses.

4. The different elements, or blocks, which taken together form the exterior pattern of a building -- having each its individual shape and dimension -- should be developed further in such a way as to define more intrinsically the functions of the several volumes they enclose.

This could be done by variety and contrast in the materials used; by fenestration; by relative scale and relative enrichment in details; by the treatment of the site; and, of course, by relative emphasis or subordination in the pattern of the building as a whole.

5. In practice, the principles noted above -- which are intended to encourage that dignity and unity which buildings gain through an exposition of their serviceability and inward character -- should be supplemented by the expression of understandings specific to each program.

These cannot be set down in a memorandum of general concepts; but it is obvious that an architect must translate into his design not only the size, importance, use and structural character of each component but also the character which his building attains or may attain, its social relevance and meanings, and those overtones of feeling which the language of architecture is meant to define.

6. These principles, moreover, are not intended as a prescription for beauty -- or even for architectural excellence. They are intended, rather, as a basis for excellence: as a statement of those intellectual satisfactions which seem essential to the nature of architecture in a world transformed by scientific thought.

Form --- attained by the well-tried expedients of proportion, relativity, rhythmic disposition --- remains an ideal of architecture; expression -- whether the consequence of traditional usages, associative values, symbol, or pictorial representation -- is still a proper attribute of buildings; nor should any architect be denied, in a measure appropriate to his theme and within the disciplines basic to his art, the irrational preferences which give individuality and piquancy to his design. Invention and resourcefulness; color, ornament and romantic allusion; fantasy, art, and surprise -- these are proper ingredients of architecture even in a modern world. The Commission of Fine Arts, in formulating these, the basic, principles of its policy, does not intend to abridge the right of an architect to the supreme command of his medium excepting only as that abridgment may bring each individual contribution to the beauty of Washington within the framework of a general and vitalizing practice.

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington, DC

March 20, 1951

Dear Mr. Hunter:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on March 19, 1951 approved the revised design which you submitted on behalf of your Office for the Law School building of Howard University.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. L. L. Hunter,
Acting Supervising Architect,
Public Buildings Service,
General Services Administration,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C

C C F A

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington, DC

March 30, 1951

Dear Mr. Hunter:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on March 19, 1951 approved the revised design which you submitted on behalf of your Office for the Administration Building of Howard University.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. E. L. Hunter,
Acting Supervising Architect,
Public Buildings Service,
General Services Administration,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT H

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington, DC

March 26, 1951

Dear Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on March 19, 1951, approved the design which was submitted by Mr. Elam in behalf of your Office for a parking lot on the grounds of the American National Red Cross at Seventeenth and D Streets, Northwest. However, the Commission would very much like to see a landscape plan for the project. The location is one that requires careful study.

For the Commission of Fine Arts.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Messrs. Justement, Elam and Derby,
Architects
2011 K Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT I

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington, DC

March 20, 1951

Dear General North:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on March 19, 1951, considered a letter received from your Consulting Architect, Mr. John F. Harbeson, recommending the appointment of Henry Kreis, of Essex, Connecticut, as the collaborating sculptor of Moore and Hutchins, architects.

The Commission approve the appointment of Mr. Kreis for this project.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Brig. Gen. Thomas North, U. S. A.,
Secretary
The American Battle Monuments Commission
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT J

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington, DC

April 3, 1951

Dear General North:

With reference to your request for a recommendation as to a collaborating painter for the World War II Memorial at Saint Laurent, France, I have to report that the Commission of Fine Arts recommend any one or all of the following artists for appointment:

Ben Shahn, Hightstown, New Jersey;

Anton Refregier, Woodstock, New York;

Gregory Kepes, Massachusetts Institute of Technology,
Cambridge, Massachusetts.

The Commission would expect the submission of a preliminary design from the artist chosen.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

E. P. Casemerer,
Secretary.

Brig. Gen. Thomas North, Secretary,
American Battle Monuments Commission,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT K

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington, DC

March 19, 1951

Dear Mr. Davis:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting today, considered a revised design for the residence of Mr. and Mrs. Gustave Ring at 2432 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., of which F. Wallace Dixon is the architect.

The Commission of Fine Arts approved the revised design, excepting the Massachusetts Avenue facade, to which the architect will give further study. He will embody further suggestions made by the Commission.

In order that the project shall not be further delayed the Commission of Fine Arts recommend that you issue a permit to the owner and architect for construction of the building, in accordance with plans submitted to you, excepting the facade facing Massachusetts Avenue. Revised drawings for the Massachusetts Avenue side of the building will be sent to you in the very near future.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. Robert E. Davis,
Director of Inspection,
District Building,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT L

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington, DC

arch 22, 1951

Dear Mr. Davis:

The Commission of Fine Arts and the Committee of Architects advising with reference to plans submitted under the "Old Georgetown" Act have experienced considerable difficulty in passing upon some of the plans because of lack of uniformity in submitting them to the Commission.

Blueprints are frequently incomplete because they do not show new work in relation to the old. Two sets of blueprints must be submitted, one to be returned to you and the other for the files of the Commission; also a copy of the application for a permit should be submitted with the blueprints, giving the name of the owner of the building. In addition, a photograph or snapshot of the building to be altered or the lot or portion of lot on which construction is proposed is required, and a plot plan showing its location on the lot.

In the case of application for a fence, a plot plan is needed showing the location of the fence proposed, as well as a photograph showing the site, and a copy of the application for a permit, including description of material and type of fence proposed.

With regard to advertising signs, the regulations of the Commission of Fine Arts pertaining to the Shipstead-Luce Act apply also to applications for signs under the "Old Georgetown" Act; that is, in particular, the size of a sign is limited to 25 square feet.

A scale drawing of the sign is required, executed in an appropriate style of lettering, as well as a photograph of the building showing its proposed location.

Furthermore, we urge that the members of your staff be required to read the "Old Georgetown" Act (a copy of which is attached) carefully. In recent weeks there have been several irregularities in the administration of the Act. For instance, this Commission has received applications for changes and alterations, whereas, on investigation by the Commission it has been disclosed that the work proposed had already been completed. Also, a few days ago a submission was received from your office for "razing" several buildings at 30th and M Streets, N. W., which indicated on the application that a permit had been granted, though subsequently canceled. This application proposes the demolition of several fine old "colonial" buildings in Georgetown, whereas the Act specifically aims to preserve such buildings. I am referring to submission O. G. No. 97, which the Commission of Fine Arts disapprove.

For the Commission of Fine Arts;

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. Robert V. Davis,
Director of Inspection,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT M

C O P Y

COPY FOR THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, the Commission of Fine Arts, and Miss Katharine M. Rhoades, or Mrs. Eugene Meyer, as provided in Paragraph 4 of the Codicil to the Will of the late Charles L. Freer, have examined the following Chinese pottery objects:

Mei-p'ing vase. Yung Lo.
Tankard. Yung Lo.
Bowl. Yung Lo.
Jar. Yung Lo.
Pair of "sunflower" bowls. Hsuan Te.
Bowl. Hsuan Te.
Bowl. Hsuan Te.
Dish. Hsuan Te.
Bowl. Hsuan Te.
Pair of dishes. Ch'eng Hua.
Mei p'ing vase. Ch'eng Hua.
Bowl. Ch'eng Hua.
Bowl. Ch'eng Hua.
Jar (cha tou). Ch'eng Hua.
Plate. Ch'eng Hua or Hung Chih.
Pair of plates. Hung Chih.
Pair of bowls. Hung Chih.
Jar (cha tou). Cheng Te.
Plate. Cheng Te.
Jar (cha tou). Cheng Te.
Plate. Chia Ching.

which have been recommended for purchase for the Freer Gallery of Art by Mr. A. G. Wenley, Director, and they hereby approve the purchase.

March 19, 1951 J. E. Graf, Acting Secretary
For the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution

March 19, 1951 David E. Finley
For the Commission of Fine Arts

EXHIBIT N

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington, DC

March 26, 1951

Dear Mr. Finley:

In behalf of the Commission of Fine Arts, I wish to thank you for the interesting booklet that you gave to the members of the Commission, describing one of the notable objects in Egyptian sculpture of the Freer Gallery of Art on exhibition in the Gallery.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. Archibald G. Wenley,
Director,
Freer Gallery of Art,
Smithsonian Institution,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C

C O P Y

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
Washington 25, D. C.

April 2, 1951

Honorable David E. Finley, Chairman
The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

Following the suggestions of your Commission at our meeting on March 20, 1951, I am happy to restate our understanding of the policy to be pursued by the Fine Arts Commission and the Public Buildings Service in the development of Painting, Sculpture, and other Fine Arts in the design of Federal buildings under our jurisdiction.

The Public Buildings Service is sensitively aware of the need of Fine Arts in our Federal buildings, and proposes to embody them in Federal buildings limited only by the practical considerations of appropriateness and limits of cost determined by applicable legislation.

The Public Buildings Service will endeavor to submit requests to the Commission for the names of painters, sculptors, and other artisans in time to permit the architect to work with the artists selected in the development of their designs.

It is recognized that no exact formula can be devised for the proportion of construction funds that can be used for Fine Arts in any Federal building, but sympathetic judgment must be exercised by those charged with the administration of the funds.

We feel that the close collaboration of the Public Buildings Service and your Commission in the recent past bespeaks our sincere devotion to the vitally important task of obtaining the best art we can get in Federal buildings.

Sincerely yours,

Administrator

EXHIBIT P